

Re: Schools reselling????

Currie Morrison (currie@hale.ssd.k12.wa.us)

Mon, 2 Sep 1996 16:21:20 -0700 (PDT)

- Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
 - Next message: Jim Callahan: "Internet Access by Area Code"
 - Previous message: Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: School Income Level"
-

>From what I have seen of IS departments at schools, and school districts as well as what I have seen of a couple of schools who have entered into agreements with ISPs to become providers to parents and students and members of the local community.....I would say NO.

Reasons:::

Most if not all IS departments are undermanned.

Modem pools are a giant headache

Real people in the real world expect real service--schools are not in the real world

Schools would be expected to subsidize those who cant afford service but would NEVER be compensated for the cost to do so.

Most school IS DEPARTMENTS DO NO UNDERSTAND CURRENT TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS

This list could go on and on but the bottom line is that schools are a poor choice as providers in any just about any scenarion that I can think of. As a hub for some local surrounding schools you might get my attention. Otherwise forget it.

Cheers!

Currie

- Next message: Jim Callahan: "Internet Access by Area Code"
- Previous message: Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: School Income Level"

Internet Access by Area Code

Jim Callahan (jcalhan@sundial.sundial.net)

Mon, 02 Sep 1996 22:35:21 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Bob Carlitz: "Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
 - Previous message: Currie Morrison: "Re: Schools reselling???"
-

>From Jim Callahan, JCalhan@Sundial.Net

On Monday, Sept. 2, 1996 Betty Dawn Hamilton wrote:

[Quote]

One question that I have been mulling over is *how much* connectivity is the target here. For example, if a school district with visionary leaders has sacrificed in other areas to gain connectivity for their schools even though they are not considered "wealthy," will they be eligible for any assistance? (We are networking within each campus, but have not acquired a WAN or internet connections. I am seeking a single commercial provider connection for my school library and will do some fundraising to pay for it.)

I am in a rural district and have asked about ISDN and T1 lines to my town. The last time I talked to a telco person (a year ago, so things may have changed), he said such lines were probably not forthcoming because *I* had been the only one to ask for one! We have little industry, such as high tech companies, who would need such lines. We are mainly a farming community (with 3 prisons here in town -- I have all kinds of visions concerning distance learning there), so digital transmissions are not much in demand.

While I am not quite sure about the technical requirements to get my school connected, I *am* knowledgeable about instructional integration of technology into the curriculum. I certainly want our students in this rural community to have the same access to technology *tools* that other students will have. I emphasize *tools* because I feel that *any* sort of technology should be used to enhance the learning process -- and should not necessarily be a "course" in itself beyond the initial "how to" instruction.

Betty

[Unquote]

My suggestion would be to talk to an Internet Service Provider (ISP), before talking to a "telco." According to Boardwatch magazine, in the 806 area code there are ISPs in Amarillo, Lubbock and Plainview.

Boardwatch Magazine's directory is available at:

<http://www.boardwatch.com/isp/>

Another on-line directory of ISPs is available at:

<http://www.vni.net/thedirectory/>

The ISPs may have their own T-1 links (provided by Telcoms) which they might be willing to re-sell and/or the ISPs may be a valuable source of information about the true state of communications connectivity in the 806 area code.

Jim Callahan
JCalhan@Sundial.Net

-
- **Next message:** Bob Carlitz: "Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
 - **Previous message:** Currie Morrison: "Re: Schools reselling????"

Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar

Bob Carlitz (bob@info-ren.pitt.edu)

Tue, 3 Sep 1996 08:44:03 -0400 (EDT)

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Sylvia Nespoli: "Universal Service Seminar"
 - Previous message: Jim Callahan: "Internet Access by Area Code"
 - Next in thread: Rex Buddenberg: "Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
-

Welcome to the second week of the Universal Service/Network Democracy on-line seminar. You will find that the seminar's home page, <http://info-ren.pitt.edu/universal-service> has been updated to include new items for the current week. I have provided a brief summary of last week's discussion and have tried to set the direction for this week's discussion and for the material that we will cover in the upcoming weeks.

In an effort to fit the broad range of issues covered in last week's discussion into a manageable set of topics, I am proposing the following list:

- SCOPE. What services should be covered by the Universal Service subsidies?
- AGGREGATION. How can schools and libraries share services with each other and with other community groups to maximize efficiency and effectiveness?
- ALLOCATION. Who gets the subsidies and under what conditions?
- INTEGRATION. How will new discounts fit in with existing programs?

Please consult the Web site for a more detailed explanation of this list. I believe each topic can be stretched so as to cover everything we talked about last week, including all the points raised in Section 254 of the Telecom Act, the paragraphs in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making that deal with schools and libraries, and the relevant portions of the FCC's Request for Further Comments. All of these primary source materials are available in excerpt form (for easy downloading) at the seminar's Web site.

This week's discussion will focus upon the SCOPE of the proposed Universal Service subsidies. This will get us into such questions as whether internal wiring should be covered, and the possibilities of including support for such things as user training and technical support. These issues are fundamental to the structure of the FCC's implementation. You will find strong viewpoints on each side of these issues.

In this week's discussion I particularly want to encourage those teachers and librarians who have not yet posted to the us-nd mailing list to make their views known. We should strive for a balance in which each participant posts an average of one message a week. We aren't doing too badly in terms of distribution of postings, but many people have yet to be heard from. Please take an active role

in the seminar, both through on-line postings and contributions to the seminar's library of contributed materials. Specific assignments for the week can be found on the Web site.

You may want to bookmark the page

<http://info-ren.pitt.edu/this-week.html>

This pointer will change each week to pick up the current week's material. Last week it pointed to "week-one.html"; now it's pointing to "week-two.html". Or you can simply refer back to the seminar's home page and jump from there to "This Week's Activities".

Please let me know if you have comments on the conduct of the course or the construction of the Web site. Insofar as there is time and labor available to accommodate your requests, we'll try to do so throughout the seminar.

Bob Carlitz
Moderator

-
- **Next message:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Universal Service Seminar"
 - **Previous message:** Jim Callahan: "Internet Access by Area Code"
 - **Next in thread:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"

Universal Service Seminar

Sylvia Nespoli (sylvia_nespoli@ridleysd.k12.pa.us)
3 Sep 1996 06:42:42 -0400

- **Messages sorted by:** [[date](#) || [thread](#) || [subject](#) || [author](#)]
- **Next message:** [Mary Harley Kruter: "Defining the Service for Schools"](#)
- **Previous message:** [Bob Carlitz: "Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"](#)
- **Next in thread:** [Bob Carlitz: "Re: Universal Service Seminar"](#)

REGARDING

Universal Service Seminar

I have a concern that the "wireline" and "wireless" companies will not have the same opportunity to bid. I am concerned that the incumbent telecommunications companies and providers will be given the first priorities to Universal Service funding.

Another portion of the library had a very strong position that "reported costs" be used to calculate support and not proxy models. It is of importance just how much the Lobbyists are involved in this procedure and are the Board members representative of the American population? Are the interests of the smaller populated areas of the country being well represented?

Sylvia Nespoli

-
- **Next message:** [Mary Harley Kruter: "Defining the Service for Schools"](#)
 - **Previous message:** [Bob Carlitz: "Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"](#)
 - **Next in thread:** [Bob Carlitz: "Re: Universal Service Seminar"](#)

Defining the Service for Schools

Mary Harley Kruter (mhkruter@patrick.mathernet.com)

Tue, 3 Sep 1996 10:26:47 -0400

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Mario Zinga: "Policy Issues"
 - Previous message: Sylvia Nespoli: "Universal Service Seminar"
-

Thanks, Steve, for answering my questions.

If I have not misunderstood the new law, it requires the FCC to define "universal service" for all potential customers, not just schools and libraries, and to define "special services" that schools, libraries, and health care facilities may require in addition to those services defined as "universal."

If this is the case, then the initial definition of "special services" that the FCC adopts will become a minimum standard of telecommunications services for schools and libraries for the foreseeable future (or for whatever duration the FCC sets before revision of definitions). Thus, the definition of "special Services" becomes of great importance to schools.

The educators' voice from this seminar should be very strong in urging a definition of "special services" that brings schools the quality and level of connectivity to the world of information and resources that our students need if they are to learn how to work and live in their 21st century world. I would propose then, that the definition of "special services" be two-way voice, data, and video communications capability connecting every school to the world's information resources. If we do not reach for a high minimum standard with which to begin, I have little hope that this legislation and its regulations will have the profound effect on students and their learning that some in the Congress anticipated with the Snow-Rockefeller amendment.

Although others in this seminar have spoken well for the case to include computer equipment for schools, training for teachers, and local area networks as part of the definition of universal or special telecommunications services, I disagree with those positions. Equipment, training, and LANs within schools and school districts are essential parts of the whole that localities can provide with their own funds, business support, and good use of state and federal education dollars that come their way.

What localities cannot do for themselves with present rate structures is to install and pay the monthly operational fees for the broadband, two-way connectivity to the external world. And the installation costs and monthly fees for broadband two-way connectivity are just what this law and the FCC can address.

Mary Harley Kruter

- **Next message: Mario Zinga: "Policy Issues"**
- **Previous message: Sylvia Neapoli: "Universal Service Seminar"**

Policy Issues

Mario Zinga (zinga@pps.pgh.pa.us)
Tue, 3 Sep 1996 10:29:08 -0400 (EDT)

- **Messages sorted by:** [[date](#) || [thread](#) || [subject](#) || [author](#)]
- **Next message:** [Steve Kohn: "Reply to Ronda's Reply"](#)
- **Previous message:** [Mary Harley Kruter: "Defining the Service for Schools"](#)
- **In reply to:** [Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: School Income Level"](#)

All

There has been much discussion on reselling and it seems to me we are veering into an area where others - elected school boards - will have the deciding vote. I would feel more comfortable if there was representation from this group in this discussion.

The legislation points to the idea that funding will be available for connectivity for K12/library groups. Before we consider all the periphery issues, can we first have a discussion on what it'll look like in the K12 environment.

For example:

- When we talk about universal service are we assuming the provider will drop a wire at the front door and be done?
(In the 80's many cable companies who promised to give schools access, met their obligation by stringing a wire to an outside wall.)
- How do we inform the discussion so that universal service doesn't end up as a small cluster of machines in a library (school or community) with a web browser? This one can lead us into a discussion of what the technology will be used for in the educational arena.

-mario zinga

-
- **Next message:** [Steve Kohn: "Reply to Ronda's Reply"](#)
 - **Previous message:** [Mary Harley Kruter: "Defining the Service for Schools"](#)
 - **In reply to:** [Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Re: School Income Level"](#)

Reply to Ronda's Reply

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)

01 Sep 1996 10:48:10 GMT

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
 - ☐ Next message: Steve Kohn: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
 - ☐ Previous message: Mario Zinga: "Policy Issues"
 - ☐ Next in thread: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply"
-

Replies to Ronda's replies. And I agree with the moderator's note.

> But who is working on making Internet access, particularly access
> to the worldwide communication that the Internet makes possible
> available to everyone in the U.S.? That's why the concept of
> POTS (Plain Old Telephone Service) was so important as it provided
> a minimum that would be available to everyone.
>
> It seems once you start saying there is no need for a minimum
> service, you can argue for all sorts of things, but the minimum
> gets lost and therefore not available.

Reply:

In my mind once you have defined a minimum, you might just have also defined the maximum.

I think the full range of telecommunications services should be available to schools via US.

Again, I don't think we should fixate on Internet access as the solution to all of the needs of education.

> I've wondered why NYNEX hasn't helped there to be a free-net or
> community network in NYC. NYC is a major city and yet it is
> backward in what it offers its citizens. Several of us presented
> talks at the NYPL (New York Public Library) about the important
> communications that the Internet made possible. Many people came
> to the talks. Several of those who came felt it was crucial
> for NYC to have some form of community network that would provide
> basic access to Usenet newsgroups and email and a text based
> browser like the Freenets and community networks provide in
> many other cities around the U.S. and in a number of cities in
> Canada. The talks were announced in lots of the local
> newspapers that announce events. Also, the talks were announced on
> Usenet. I would have expected someone from NYNEX to have been
> interested. However, no one got in contact with us or seemed
> interested.

Reply:

It sounds like an interesting discussion and if I had known about it I would have probably attended.

I live on Long Island so I don't read the local NYC papers and even though I'm on the Internet daily, I don't participate in Usenet newsgroups yet. So... next time you are going to have a meeting please email me with the info.

Thanks

> That's why it seems that there needs to be some government provision
> identifying what is a minimum standard and providing the regulation
> to provide for it. Otherwise it would seem that the teleco's would
> determine what they think is needed, and citizens will be considered
> "customers" rather than citizens.

Reply:

I think you have a misconception on how this procedure is going to be rolled out. Telcos will not be deciding what is offered to schools and libraries - the FCC will. See above for comments on minimum standards.

> Steve, is there some reason that NYNEX isn't in support of having
> a Freenet or local community network like the Cleveland Free-Net in
> New York City? Is there some reason that they haven't been encouraging
> to have such a minimal set of access to Usenet newsgroups, email
> and a text based browser made available to everyone at a low or
> free cost so that people will have some minimal level of Internet
> connection available as people in the U.S. in other cities like
> Cleveland, and Youngstown, and Washington D.C. and Los Angeles, etc.
> have available?

Reply:

Access isn't the limiting factor for people to participate in free-nets. More people have phone service. How many people have PCs equipped with modems???

I can't speak for NYNEX, but I think we would be more than willing to sit down with any group that is thinking about forming a freenet in NYC. Please see other discussion on this board concerning the Buffalo freenet and NYNEX's involvement.

> Ronda
> rh120@columbia.edu

-
- ☐ **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
 - ☐ **Previous message:** Mario Zinga: "Policy Issues"
 - ☐ **Next in thread:** Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply"

re: Professional Development - comments on comments

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)
01 Sep 1996 10:30:10 GMT

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
- ☐ Next message: Bob Carlitz: "Re: Universal Service Seminar"
- ☐ Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Reply to Ronda's Reply"
- ☐ Next in thread: Currie Morrison : "re: Professional Development"

Responding to Ronda's comments:

- > Why are funds needed for content? The Internet makes it possible for
- > people to contribute their own content. Thus what is needed is
- > access so people can contribute content, not payment for content.

Reply:

My wife is a 2nd grade teacher. She doesn't have the time or inclination to develop content from resources on the Internet. All I do is education, and I don't see a ground swell of teachers interested in speeding hours on the Internet first finding data, developing it into useful information and then integrating it into curriculum.

Of course, like in everything else, there are a few teachers who will do this and enjoy it. They might even share with other teachers. Once this starts to become popular you will have companies like Scholastic (and they have already started - Scholastic Online) to package Internet based content for \$\$.

Access should not be equated to content!

- > The communications aspects of the Internet are what the FCC is
- > being charged with making available.

Reply:

Again, please read the legislation. There is no mention of access to the Internet specifically that I know of. We all know that access to the Internet was in the minds of Snow/Rockefeller, but not the whole answer. If we do not make voice messaging, distance learning, and other network based services to schools via US we are doing education a disservice.

- > That is why the current Telecommunications Act is a problem, not
- > a solution to the issue of how to provide universal service
- > in computer networking - it puts providing cut rates to businesses
- > and subsidies to corporate entities above providing universal
- > service.

Reply:

Again, I think you need to read the legislation - US is not just about computer networking.

I don't know what you are referring to when you say the T.A. "... puts providing cut rates to businesses and subsidies to corporate entities above providing universal service."

What cut rates and what subsidies?

> So it seems there is a need to talk about how to provide for
> universal service to all residential users, rather than just
> to schools and libraries as part of this online discussion.

Reply:

I think there are too many issues and too little time just with US for schools and libraries to expand the scope of these discussions to include residential US.

> Don't we need to look at situations like this around the world
> to see how the U.S. is currently falling farther and farther
> behind as it speculates about offering "advanced telecommunications
> services" and therefore the minimal access to the Internet
> is denied to people in cities like NYC.

Reply:

How is minimal access to the Internet being denied to the people of NYC????

Anyone with a phone, PC, modem and an ISP has access! Most people have phone service. There are numerous PCs and modem vendors, and tons of ISPs in NYC - so what is the problem you are referring to?

> Don't we have to sort out what is important. I recognize that certain
> minimal sectors of the U.S. were asked what they wanted by Congress
> when they drafted the Telecommunications Act of 1996, but they left out
> the majority of us and therefore to now go along and only discuss what
> the telcos asked for is not going to provide what we who should have
> been involved in the process much earlier need and have been fighting
> for.

Reply:

Senators Snow and Rockefeller orginated the concept of US for Schools and Libraries, not the telcos. The telcos are presently meeting with most of the major national educational organizations to help develop workable US definitions and procedures.

> Ronda
> rh120@columbia.edu

[Moderator's Note: In the future I will probably suggest that lengthy exchanges of this sort be conducted by personal e-mail. In this seminar I hope we can concentrate on those specific issues which are being determined by the current Universal Service proceedings before the FCC, with an emphasis on those provisions which apply to schools and libraries. I don't want to rule out questions of home access, where those questions might be crucial for meeting the primary missions of the schools and libraries, but the focus of the seminar is not meant to cover all Universal Service issues. We could of course consider another forum in which these broader issues would be addressed, but let's see if we can make the present one work first.]

-
- ☐ Next message: Bob Carlitz: "Re: Universal Service Seminar"
 - ☐ Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Reply to Ronda's Reply"
 - ☐ Next in thread: Currie Morrison: "re: Professional Development"

Re: Universal Service Seminar

Bob Carlitz (bob@info-ren.pitt.edu)

Tue, 3 Sep 1996 12:16:17 -0400 (EDT)

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Emilio Gonzalez: "Re[2]: Professional Development"
 - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
 - In reply to: Sylvia Nespoli: "Universal Service Seminar"
-

On 3 Sep 1996, Sylvia Nespoli wrote:

```
> REGARDING           Universal Service Seminar
>
> I have a concern that the "wireline" and "wireless" companies will not
> have the same opportunity to bid. I am concerned that the incumbent
> telecommunications companies and providers will be given the first priorities
> to Universal Service funding.
> Another portion of the library had a very strong position that "reported
> costs" be used to calculate support and not proxy models. It is of importance
> just how much the Lobbyists are involved in this procedure and are the Board
> members representative of the American population? Are the interests of the
> smaller populated areas of the country being well represented?
>
> Sylvia Nespoli
```

Sylvia has asked previously about the composition of the Federal-State Joint Board. You can find a list of the Board's members at the end of the Notice of Proposed Rule Making. It includes representatives of a number of state public utility commissions and a few people representing consumer interests. I see nobody from education on the list, although some of the PUC or consumer representatives might have an education background.

With regard to the role of lobbyists in these proceedings, I think it's fair to say that proceedings of this sort have traditionally been almost entirely in the hands of "lobbyists," whether in the form of staff hired by industry groups affected by the legislation or staff hired by Washington-based public interest groups. Here I'm using the term "lobbyist" to describe someone whose primary job is to work on legislative issues of this sort.

The whole idea of "Network Democracy" is to broaden the base of participation in government rule making processes. Fortunately, the Internet gives us a mechanism to publish materials submitted to government agencies, to educate interested people in the issues before these agencies and to gather public responses on these issues. This is just what we are trying to do in the present seminar. It's very important that the many educators and librarians who have registered for the seminar should speak up on a regular basis. This isn't a place to sit back and listen to the "experts." Rather it's a place to make known your concerns and to form recommendations based upon your considerable experience in the practical application of telecommunications technology. By doing

so you'll be filling an important gap in the past practice of agencies such as the FCC which have had a hard time in gathering information directly from the people affected by their policies. If we can state our opinions concisely and clearly, I think they will be listened to.

Bob Carlitz
Moderator

-
- **Next message:** Emilio Gonzalez: "Ref21: Professional Development"
 - **Previous message:** Steve Kohn: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
 - **In reply to:** Sylvia Nespoli: "Universal Service Seminar"

Re[2]: Professional Development

Emilio Gonzalez (Emilio_Gonzalez@ed.gov)
Tue, 3 Sep 1996 12:18:51 -0400

- **Messages sorted by:** [date || thread || subject || author]
 - **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Wire To The Schoolhouse Door"
 - **Previous message:** Bob Carlitz: "Re: Universal Service Seminar"
-

Steve Kohn writes:

>between \$20B and \$~\$47B depending what is included - just for telecommunication
>services. Now double that if you want to include professional development.
>Now develop a surcharge to cover this and you are probably looking at a ~20%
>~25% surcharge on people's phone bills once you include residential universal
>service also - will the FCC support such a tax??

Most estimates place the telecommunications cost for providing K-12 schools and libraries with Internet access at \$1 - 2 billion. I wonder what services are being referred to when numbers in the \$20 -- \$47 billion range are being thrown around. Could you please provide a source(s) for these "estimates"?

- **Next message:** Bill Cosh: "Wire To The Schoolhouse Door"
- **Previous message:** Bob Carlitz: "Re: Universal Service Seminar"

Wire To The Schoolhouse Door

Bill Cosh (bcosh@wasb.org)

Tue, 03 Sep 1996 12:23:43 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
- Next message: Currie Morrison : "re: Professional Development"
- Previous message: Emilio Gonzalez: "Ref2!: Professional Development"
- Next in thread: Brenda Williams: "Re: Wire To The Schoolhouse Door"

Just a quick cautionary note over potentially using a concept such as deploying a "wire to the schoolhouse door" by a telco in part of the US definition.

When our state was struggling with deregulation issues two years ago, we also received similar pledges from the major telco's in our state about "Bringing the Information Superhighway to the Doorstep of every school in the state".

Unfortunately, two years later we, and our legislature, are now learning what those pledges meant. First every school didn't mean every school, it turned out to mean only the schools located in Ameritech's service area. The schools located in the service areas of the 92 other telco's got nothing.

Ameritech then clarified that when they said every school, they really only meant every high school. Elementary schools were not part of their pledge.

To the door of the school actually meant to the nearest man hole cover, lamp post of other landmark that the telco had already deployed fiber optics. Cost of connecting physically to the building in some cases wasn't included.

I would hope that the FCC's rules would be more definitive, and would proactively address situations such as "What about new schools? Will they also be hooked up under the established commitments? In Wisconsin, they weren't. Also, what is a school? Do charter schools count? Wisconsin had to amend its rules to assure that they would have access similar to the other public schools in Wisconsin.

Bill Cosh
Wisconsin Association of School Boards

-
- Next message: Currie Morrison : "re: Professional Development"
 - Previous message: Emilio Gonzalez: "Ref2!: Professional Development"
 - Next in thread: Brenda Williams: "Re: Wire To The Schoolhouse Door"

re: Professional Development

Currie Morrison (currie@hale.ssd.k12.wa.us)

Tue, 3 Sep 1996 11:50:23 -0700 (PDT)

- **Messages sorted by:** [[date](#) | [thread](#) | [subject](#) | [author](#)]
- **Next message:** [St. Francis School: "re:Educational Value"](#)
- **Previous message:** [Bill Cosh: "Wire To The Schoolhouse Door"](#)
- **In reply to:** [Steve Kohn: "re: Professional Development – comments on comments"](#)

The debate whether the new act is intended to just drop a wire at the door step of the district IS office or whether it is intended to not only drop the wire at each door step at each school and library but also to give us some training in the potential uses of this tool is the question in my mind.

The regulations which will be the result of our inputs and many others will be reflected in the final regs. This is as far as I can tell something a little new in our demomocracy. As usual the lobbyist for the big boys will always want to keep their obligations to government minimal while maximizing their profit potential. That is a given, we shouldn't particularly resent as much as just recognize that is it their and learn how to deal with it.

Yes, we need the training.

Yes, we need ongoing support to make our younger generation competitive in a world wide economy

Yes, we need low cost access devices

Yes, we need standardized protocols

Yes, we need max bandwidth

Yes, we need regional hubs

Yes, we need more than just a few people who are interested in new things to integrate technology into the daily fabric of student learning.

This is part of the bargain for school reform that schools owe the public sector.

Cheers!

Currie

```

      / 0 0 \
=====oo0=( )=0oo=====
| \-----/ |
| |      Currie Morrison      * currie@hale.ssd.k12.wa.us | |
| |      Nathan Hale High School * Technology Coordinator | |
| |      HTTP://hale.ssd.k12.wa.us * Seattle Public Schools | |
| \-----/ |
===== ( )=0ooo.=====
      \ ( ( )
       \ ) ) /
        ( /

```

- **Next message:** St. Francis School: "re: Educational Value"
- **Previous message:** Bill Cosh: "Wire To The Schoolhouse Door"
- **In reply to:** Steve Kohn: "re: Professional Development – comments on comments"

re:Educational Value

St. Francis School (stfrancis@ntr.net)

Tue, 03 Sep 1996 14:57:27 -0700

- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]
 - **Next message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
 - **Previous message:** Currie Morrison : "re: Professional Development"
-

In response to Currie Morrison's comment, "Waiting for the next generation of college trained teachers is too long to wait. This legislation needs to be manipulated and a way that a significant sum of money be spent on training and acceptable uses of this technology. THIS IS AN AREA WHERE BUSINESS SEEMS TO DO A MUCH BETTER JOB THAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS. Why????"

When educators team with business people, an untold wealth of knowledge and expertise can become available. By combining 20 years of business experience with 3 years of teaching/educational volunteer work, I was able to evaluate, plan and implement a high tech computer lab (We call it Beyond 2000) that virtually pays for itself!!! The lab contains 12 petium 100 computers, two color scanners, two color printers, one large screen TV connected to one computer (for demo purposes), internet access via an ISDN phone line and a large file server (Novell 4.1). ANY school can accomplish this. (I now spend part of every day consulting with other schools who want to do the same thing,

Diane Seagle
stfrancis@ntr.net

- **Next message:** Rex Buddenberg: "Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
- **Previous message:** Currie Morrison : "re: Professional Development"

Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar

Rex Buddenberg (budden@nps.navy.mil)
Tue, 03 Sep 96 12:10:43 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: WANG@rbs.org: "And another thing....."
 - Previous message: St. Francis School: "re:Educational Value"
 - In reply to: Bob Carlitz: "Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
 - Next in thread: LANA: "RE: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
-

I need somebody who can translate the text of the law into something mortals can understand:

- where does the \$ to support universal services come from?
- what's the allowable limit within the law that we can spend it on?

Without these constraints properly defined, we're going to talk ourselves in circles for a long time.

- > SCOPE. What services should be covered by the Universal
- > Service subsidies?

The law uses the term 'evolved set' clearly indicating that the list changes over time.

The 'telecommunications industry' definition is very broad ... would include computer companies, ISPs, CATV, VSAT, etc ... much more than just the telcos.

But it appears that the fund gozintas come only from the 'telecommunications carriers'. I didn't find the exact definition, other than a reference to interstate commerce. But it appears that this input to the 'Fund' is from a quite limited subset of the telecommunications industry.

Since the law also explicitly bans cross subsidization, it would appear that the a scheme that would use the inputs from the telecommunications carriers to fund a broader array of services (to wit, Internet services) would be in conflict. As an example, use of the Universal Service Fund to pay for VSAT connectivity (which is provided by a non-regulated vendor within the definition of telecomm industry but outside the definition of telecom carrier) would not be supportable.

Rex Buddenberg

- **Next message:** WANG@rbs.org: "And another thing....."
- **Previous message:** St. Francis School: "re:Educational Value"
- **In reply to:** Bob Carlitz: "Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
- **Next in thread:** LANA: "RE: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"

And another thing.....

WANG@rbs.org

Tue, 03 Sep 1996 17:47:15 -0500 (EST)

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Regina Wooden: "Re: suggested topic"
 - Previous message: Rex Buddenberg: "Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"
-

Hello,

And in addition to everything else that Currie listed in the attached message, we also need ONGOING EVALUATION to document and monitor our progress. In an earlier message, someone suggested that the resources be divided in thirds: hardware, professional development, and ongoing technical assistance. I propose 30% for each of the above, leaving 10% for evaluation. Therefore, a \$2M undertaking should earmark \$200K for evaluation. This may sound like a lot for those who want more funds for hardware, but think of the many past projects from which nothing was learned because of inadequate evaluation.

Patsy Wang-Iverson

[Moderator's Note: Since all previous messages can be found on the Universal Service/Network Democracy Web site (or in participants' mailboxes), I clipped Patsy's attached message. Please refrain from using long quotes where you can help it.]

- Next message: Regina Wooden: "Re: suggested topic"
- Previous message: Rex Buddenberg: "Re: Welcome to Week Two of the US/ND seminar"

Re: suggested topic

Regina Wooden (wooden@apsicc.aps.edu)

Tue, 03 Sep 1996 16:59:30 +0000

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
- Next message: Steve C. Andrade: "Re: Welcome to Universal Service/Network Democracy"
- Previous message: WANG@rbs.org: "And another thing....."

Carl Redwood wrote:

>

> Some people believe that universal service subsidies should be extended
> to cultural and community based organizations in addition to schools and
> libraries. Should schools and libraries support these efforts?

Aren't schools and libraries cultural and community based organizations?
If they aren't now then this could help to revitalize that component
that is currently lacking- if they are then the schools and libraries
will lead the way and provide support to privately or locally funded
organizations and thus reinforce their role in the community.

--

Regina Wooden
multiplying wants but
wooden@apsicc.aps.edu
EPMS ROARS

"the essence of civilization is not in
in eliminating needs"

home page: <http://thuntek.net/~plucero/index.html>

school pages: <http://www.aps.edu/aps/epms/epms.html/>

-----/_/_/_0-----

-
- Next message: Steve C. Andrade: "Re: Welcome to Universal Service/Network Democracy"
 - Previous message: WANG@rbs.org: "And another thing....."

Re: Welcome to Universal Service/Network Democracy

Steve C. Andrade (STEVEA@BROWNVN.BROWN.EDU)

Tue, 03 Sep 96 19:59:09 EDT

- Messages sorted by: [date || thread || subject || author]
 - Next message: Bob Carlitz: "new items in the library"
 - Previous message: Regina Wooden: "Re: suggested topic"
 - Next in thread: Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Universal Network and Learning"
-

Just some opening thoughts.

I have read about half of the initial postings and my current thoughts are based on some of the postings therein.

I don't assume that large Telco's have the first clue as to what to do to support learning activities through telecommunication facilities. Educators need to be in strategic positions of influence to make any sense out of universal access. There are plenty of voices, as demonstrated through the participants here, with plenty of good ideas. Typically most companies have to be dragged to the table and negotiated into reasonably good services. That takes alot of time and effort, usually on the part of a few good souls who are technical and pedogocially strong enough to make a strong case.

One thing Telco's are good at is basic infrastructure. If you want to get a fiber bundle from point A to point B, they have the skill and talent and resources to do that. I have always felt that infrastructure buildout is something companies can do, and probably do well. Wiring the schools is an enormous national challenge, one that volunteer net days will only scratch the surface of. Wiring infrastructure is also one of the major impediments to getting kids online. I take the "build and they will come" attitude with this. It happened with voice service, it happened with the internet, it happened with roads, I think it will happen with universal access.

While I am at it, I would encourage us all to think out of the box. Lets not be digital zealots. There is voice, video and data to contend with here.

Imagine what are schools could be with a creative application of voice mail for registration, homework, school updates etc. That would be truly transformative in most communities today...it certainly would be in mine. Hosting voice mail facilities is a no-brainer for a NYNEX. It is something they can do. With a little thought, a small team of educators could whip up a great service. Mom and dad and junior (btw...almost everyone has a phone at home) would suddenly be able to link and communicate with the local school district.

More thoughts later. Happy reading....hope your eyes hold out!

- Next message: Bob Carlitz: "new items in the library"
- Previous message: Regina Wooden: "Re: suggested topic"
- Next in thread: Betty Dawn Hamilton: "Universal Network and Learning"